

c) REMARKS

The claims are 12 and 13. Claims 14-25 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 12 is amended to better define the intended invention and reconsideration of the claims is expressly requested.

The election of Group I, claims 12 and 13, is confirmed.

Claim 12 has been amended to emphasize that the impedance regulating means is spaced, inter alia, in each movable reactor as shown on page 21, line 14 to page 22, line 10 and in Fig. 5. Therefore, it is unnecessary to select any one of the individual matching units for Figs. 3 and 4, for example, which simplifies handling and reduces selection errors. Since the impedance regulating means is spaced on each moveable reactor, then microadjustment of impedance is simplified. Accordingly, matching adjustment is not required even though reactors of different impedance are employed, as shown in Example 1. As shown in Comparative Example 1 where impedance regulators were not individually provided for the movable reactor sections having different impedances, then high frequency matching devices in the high frequency power supply means were replaced to correspond to the reactor sections in order to match impedances. As noted on specification pages 34 and 35, the deposition operation was delayed as compared to operations in Example 1. In Example 1, only one set of matching devices is used, while in Comparative Example 1, two sets of matching devices must be used.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected as obvious over Okamura (JP '546) in view of Turlot '986. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Okamura, as admitted by the Examiner, fails to teach individual impedance regulation means for each moveable reactor. Okamura requires matching adjustment each

time a reactor with a different impedance is used. This deficiency is not remedied by Turlot.

Turlot does not disclose separate reactors and high-frequency power supply means, a moving means for moving the reactors or a plurality of reactors having impedances different from each other. Further, Turlot neither discloses nor suggests that an impedance regulation means is provided in each movable reactor.

In addition, Turlot discloses, as provided in column 1, lines 16-24, a plasma treatment apparatus by which a number of work-pieces may be parallel-processed. Fig. 5(c) of Turlot shows, as explained at column 6, line 66 to column 7, line 11, that to effect parallel processing, adjusted power is simultaneously fed to the respective chambers from a central generator with a centralized matching network and, if necessary, with additional matching networks for chamber specific adjustment. In Turlot, when reactors having different impedances are used, matching adjustment is needed each time. In contrast, according to the present invention, when the reactors having different impedances are used, matching adjustment is not needed every time.

The claims should be allowed and the case passed to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Saxon
Peter Saxon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 474002v1